

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Yes, elevated; it is part of the viaduct. The viaduct divides into two parts at this point.

Mr. WALSH: When you get back on your main line do you cross the Lachine canal?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Yes.

Mr. WALSH: Then you cross it again?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: This is the present—

The CHAIRMAN: Will you describe that again?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: (Indicating on Plan) This is the central terminal area with the station south of Dorchester street. This is Belmont street; the extension is to be put through. Then Lagauchetiere street, St. Antoine street and St. James street; there is an elevated viaduct crossing all these streets. The grades are separated. This is the new viaduct leading from the central station to Victoria bridge. This connection here is also elevated to connect the viaduct and the existing main line from St. Henri to Victoria bridge.

Mr. DEACHMAN: Will you trace that line from Ottawa?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The line from Ottawa is through Coteau, Turcot yards, St. Henri into Bonaventure station.

Mr. WALSH: I want the committee to notice that on the line he has just traced there are no crossings of the Lachine canal. Now, trace the new line, the proposed line going from Ottawa to Montreal. One will cross the Lachine canal and the second crosses the Lachine canal, and is it not going to take you longer to get your trains in?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: For the present that is the plan.

Mr. WALSH: We all know the difficulty of putting trains across the Lachine canal, and at the present time they are not crossing it, and with your new proposal you are going to cross it twice. It is going to interfere with the traffic on the Lachine canal seriously. It severely interferes with your faster trains from the west.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I think that Mr. Fairweather will give you something on the crossings.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: The question, I take it, is that the proposal to route the Canadian National trains which cross the Ottawa river at St. Annes into the new central terminal will lead to delays both to railway and canal traffic by reason of the fact that those trains will cross the canal twice whereas they do not now cross the canal at all. Is that the question?

Mr. WALSH: Yes.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: Of course, that situation is one which was carefully examined before we considered adopting that particular type of entrance as an alternative to the other entrance which could be made north of the mountain. Careful observations were made as to the interference which takes place on the trains which now cross the canal at or near St. Henri and also to the interference which takes place on the Montreal and Southern Counties trains down at this end of the canal (Black's Bridge). Observations were taken to find out what that interference would amount to in terms of railway traffic and also in terms of canal traffic, and it is my judgment, based upon that study made under my own direction, that this particular objection to the terminal plan is one that looms large when you talk about it but when you get down to brass tacks—

Mr. WALSH: Does it not loom large as a factor—not as a talking factor but as a real economic factor?

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: I am speaking as one who has made a study of the situation.